

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 09/890,588	Applicant(s) ARDES, WILHELM	
	Examiner Matthew O Savage	Art Unit 1723	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Matthew O Savage.

(3) Ms. Catherine Bishop.

(2) David J. Rikkers.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 June 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: Vokes.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

M. Savage

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was agreed that the proposed amendments to claim 1 (see the attached draft amendment submitted via facsimile on 6-16-03) would overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph of claim 1. Ms. Bishop and Mr. Ridders indicated that the filter insert had not been positively claimed in combination with the filter in claim 1. The examiner suggested inserting "for producing said interference fit" after "contours on line 2 to obviate the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph of that claim. The examiner maintained that the packing ring 6 was capable of producing an interference fit with the tube 4 since it would tend to extrude radially inwardly against the tube 7 when compressed between the end face of passage 7 and flat annular portion of the depression in plate 5 while being confined at an outer periphery thereof by the radially outer side of the depression..